



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/538,028	03/01/2006	Bernhard Wietfeld	ON/4-32797A	8921
1095 NOVARTIS CORPORATE INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY ONE HEALTH PLAZA 104/3 EAST HANOVER, NJ 07936-1080	7590 03/29/2007		EXAMINER GRAZIER, NYEEMAH	ART UNIT 1626 PAPER NUMBER
SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE		
31 DAYS	03/29/2007	PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/538,028	WIETFELD ET AL.
	Examiner Nyeemah Grazier	Art Unit 1626

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 1 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 6/8/05.
 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-10 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) _____ is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) 1-10 are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

I. ACTION SUMMARY

Claims 1-10 are currently pending in the instant application.

II. Lack of Unity of Invention

The inventions listed below as Groups I-IV do not relate to a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1 because, under PCT Rule 13.2, they lack the same or corresponding special technical features. PCT Rule 13.2 states that the international application shall relate to one invention only or to a group of inventions so linked as to form a single general inventive concept as required under unity of invention. A *prima facie* showing of unity of invention can be demonstrated when there is a technical relationship among inventions involving one or more of the same or corresponding special features. R. 13.2. A “special technical feature” is a technical feature, in which, when taken as a whole define a contribution over the prior art. Annex B, Part 1(b). Annex B, Part 1(e), providing combinations of different categories of claims, states in relevant part:

The method for determining unity of invention under Rule 13 shall be construed to be as permitting, in particular, the inclusion of any one of the following combinations of claims of different categories in the same international application:

(i) in addition to an independent claim for a given product, an independent claim for a process specially adapted for the manufacture of the said product, and an independent claim for a use of the said product, or

(ii) in addition to an independent claim for a given process, an independent claim for an apparatus or means specifically designed for carrying out the said process, or


(iii) in addition to an independent claim for a given product, an independent claim for a process specially adapted for the manufacture of the said product, and an independent claim for an apparatus or means specifically designed for carrying out the said process.”

This application contains the following inventions that are not linked to form a single general invention pursuant to PCT Rule 13.1. Restriction is therefore required under 35


Art Unit: 1626

U.S.C. § 121 and 372. This application contains the following inventions or groups of inventions that are not linked to form a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1. The following groups are subject to restriction in accordance to PCT Rule 13.2:


I. Group I, claims 1-4, drawn to the process of making compounds of Formula (I):




II. Group II, claim 5, drawn to the compounds of Formula (VI):



III. Group III, claims 6, 7, and 10, drawn to the process of making the compounds of Formula (VIII):



IV. Group IV, claims 8 and 9, drawn to the compounds of Formula (XIV):



Applicant is required to elect one of the abovementioned groups when replying to this Action. See 37 CFR § 1.499.

The invention listed in Groups I-IV do not relate to a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1 because, under PCT Rule 13.2, they lack the same or corresponding

special technical features. Specifically, they do not share the same essential structural elements that define the “special technical feature” necessary to specify a contribution over the prior art. In the instant case, there is no structural moiety depicted as a genus that could be construed as the technical feature that is common in all four inventive groups. Therefore is not a *special* technical feature capable of making a contribution over the prior art. PCT Rule 13.2.

Applicant is encouraged to particularly describe a compound that is not listed above by specifically pointing out the definitions of each variable.

Advisory of Rejoinder

The examiner has required restriction between product and process claims. Where applicant elects claims directed to the product, and the product claims are subsequently found allowable, withdrawn process claims that depend from or otherwise require all the limitations of the allowable product claim will be considered for rejoinder. All claims directed to a nonelected process invention must require all the limitations of an allowable product claim for that process invention to be rejoined.

In the event of rejoinder, the requirement for restriction between the product claims and the rejoined process claims will be withdrawn, and the rejoined process claims will be fully examined for patentability in accordance with 37 CFR 1.104. Thus, to be allowable, the rejoined claims must meet all criteria for patentability including the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 101, 102, 103 and 112. Until all claims to the elected product are found allowable, an otherwise proper restriction requirement between product claims and process claims may be maintained. Withdrawn process claims that are not commensurate in scope with an allowable product claim will not be rejoined. See MPEP § 821.04(b). Additionally, in order to retain the right to rejoinder in accordance with the above policy, applicant is advised that the process claims should be amended during prosecution to require the limitations of the product claims. **Failure to do so may result in a loss of the right to rejoinder.** Further, note that the prohibition against double patenting rejections

of 35 U.S.C. 121 does not apply where the restriction requirement is withdrawn by the examiner before the patent issues. See MPEP § 804.01. Applicant is reminded that upon cancellation of claims to a nonelected invention, the inventions must be amended in compliance with 37 C.F.R. 1.48(b) if one of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a petition under 37 C.F.R. 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 C.F.R. 1.17(i).

In accordance with 37 CFR 1.499, applicant is required, in reply to this action, to elect a single invention to which the claims must be restricted. As stated above, this is not an exhaustive list, as it would be impossible to produce such a list under the time constraints due to the large volume of subject matter claimed in this application.

The claims herein lack unity of invention under PCT Rules 13.1 and 13.2 because, pursuant to 37 C.F.R. 1.475(a) the instant invention lacks unity of invention since under 37 CFR 1.475:

Where a group of inventions is claimed in an application, the requirement of unity of invention shall be fulfilled only when there is a technical feature among those inventions involving one or more of the same or corresponding special technical features...those technical features that define a contribution which each of the claimed inventions, considered as a whole, makes over the prior art.

There is no structural moiety common to **Groups I-IV**, and therefore the *technical feature* is lacking. Therefore, Claims 1-10 are not so linked as to form a single general inventive concept and there is a lack of unity of invention. Because the claims do not relate to a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1 and lack the same or corresponding special technical features, the claims lack unity of invention and should be limited to a product, a process for the manufacture of said product, or a method of use.

Furthermore, with respect to **Groups I-IV**, even if unity of invention under 37 CFR 1.475(a) is not lacking, under 37 CFR 1.475(b) a national stage application containing claims to different categories of invention will be considered to have unity of invention if the claims are drawn only to one of the following combinations:

- (1) A product and a process specially adapted for the manufacture of said product; or
- (2) A product and process of use of said product; or
- (3) A product, a process specially adapted for the manufacture of the said product, and a use of the said product; or
- (4) A process and an apparatus or means specially designed for carrying out the said process; or
- (5) A product, a process specially adapted for the manufacture of the said product, and an apparatus or means specially designed for carrying out the said process.

Moreover, according to 37 CFR 1.475(c),

If an application contains claims to more or less than one of the combinations of categories of invention set forth in paragraph (b), unity of invention might not be present.

In the instant case the claims are drawn to more than one product, process, and method of use. According to 37 CFR 1.475(e), the determination whether a group of inventions is so linked as to form a single general inventive concept shall be made without regard to whether the inventions are claimed in separate claims or as alternatives within a single claim.

As a result, the claims lack unity of invention and applicant is required to elect a single invention and a single compound, including an exact definition of all substituents and variables wherein a single member at each substituent group or moiety is selected. For example, if a base molecule has a substituent group R₁, wherein R₁ is recited to be any one of H, OH, COOH, aryl, alkoxy, halogen, amino, etc., then applicant

Art Unit: 1626

must select a single substituent of R1, for example OH or aryl and each subsequent variable position.

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include an election of the invention to be examined even if the restriction requirement is traversed (37 CFR 1.143).

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include an election of the invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143).


III. CONCLUSION

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Nyeemah Grazier whose telephone number is (571) 272-8781. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 8:30 a.m. - 5:00 p.m.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Joseph K. McKane, can be reached on (571) 272 - 0699. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571)-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Very truly yours,



Nyeemah Grazier

Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1626

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
400 Dulany Street
Alexandria, VA 22314-5774
Tel. No.: (571) 272-8781



Joseph K. McKane

Supervisory Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1626

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
400 Dulany Street
Alexandria, VA 22314-5774